

## REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on April 6, 2005. Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 14-17 are pending for examination. The Examiner, after working with these claims through ten rounds of examination and appeal, has at long last rejected all the standing claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Further, the Examiner has rejected all of the standing claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Goodman (of record) in view of Chau, US 5764750, hereinafter Chau.

In regard to the 112 rejections, if these rejections have merit they should have been made at some time in the extensive prosecution of the case. It seems odd that such objections would be made at this late date. The applicant has reviewed each of the points, and finds them all to be spurious. For example, the Examiner alleges that there is no written description that the claimed bridge adapter unit has "an inlet port" as claimed, yet the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 7 in the originally-filed specification states "Bridge Adapter Unit 101 provides circuitry with ports 111 for connecting to a communications network 110 and ports 112 for connecting to telephony equipment such as facsimile machine 141 and telephone 140. In some embodiments a large number of telephone ports may be provided, and Bridge Adapter Unit 101 may function as a PBX exchange."

Further to the above and relative to ports for the adapter unit, Fig. 3 is explicit in the position and connection of the adapter unit. Any person of ordinary skill can see that unit 301 has a port connecting to the ATM network and another connecting to the internal telephone wiring. Further still, the language of an inlet port in this unit was a part of claim 1 in the originally filed specification, and is therefore as-filed disclosure supporting

future claim language. There is still further ample support for this claim language in the specification.

As to the allegation that there is no support that the bridge adapter unit drives the telephone wiring structure, the Examiner is referred to the description in the specification beginning at page 9, line 3: "In embodiments of the present invention micro-PBX is a converter and bus management system adapted to receive ATM data for all of the devices in the unit 100 to which the micro-PBX is connected, and to route the data in a different protocol onto the internal bus. Micro-PBX 301 operates the in-house wiring as a bus system under a multiple access points type protocol, such as Carrier Sense Multi Access/Collision Detect (CSMA/CD) protocol. This is a protocol type well-known in the art that was also the basis of original Ethernet<sup>TM</sup> systems."

The applicant has underlined a particular sentence for the Examiner's attention. Perhaps the Examiner prefers "operates" rather than "drives", but this sentence surely is ample evidence that the applicant was in possession of this aspect of claimed invention at the time of the filing. In fact, claim 1 of the original filing is not so far removed from the present claim 1, and certainly was in possession of the inventor at the time the application was filed.

As to the allegation that there is no support for the translation of public network signals regardless of protocol, applicant reminds the Examiner that all signals received are translated to the bus protocol selected to operate on the internal wiring. There is ample description in specific examples, and this operation is supported throughout the spec.

The applicant is amazed at these allegations of not being in possession of the claimed invention, and it appears to be entirely spurious. The applicant insists that these allegations simply be withdrawn without further comment.

As to the merit rejections, the applicant will deal with the rejection specifically of claim 1, which if patentable, renders claim 7 patentable as having essentially the same limitations as claim 1, and all depended claims are then patentable at least as depended from patented claims.

Claim 1 recites:

1. *(Currently Amended) A networking system for a home or business site, comprising:  
a bridge adapter unit at the home or business site, having an inlet port for receiving public network protocol signals; and  
a telephone wiring structure in the site, the wiring structure having multiple end points and one or more junctions, and connected at a single point to an outlet port of the bridge adapter unit;  
characterized in that the bridge adapter unit drives the telephone wiring structure according to a Local Area Network (LAN) protocol, translates all received public network protocol signals, regardless of protocol, to the single LAN protocol, and modulates the signals in a manner to correct signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points driven from a single point at the bridge adapter unit.*

The Examiner alleges that Goodman teaches the invention substantially as claimed. This is a gross overstatement, because Goodman teaches only an architecturally similar system which has none of the functionality of the claimed system, as the Examiner admits near the end of his paragraph 7.

The Examiner applies Chau (new) to teach all of the specific functionality claimed. In applying Chau, the Examiner states that Chau discloses... and then **quotes the applicant's claim language**, as though it were Chau's teaching. This is a dodge, and absolutely not adequate to support a rejection. The only representation of Chau applied

by tyhe Examiner is "[see Chau, Figure 1, item 40, abstract, col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 1-27.

Fig. 1, item 40 of Chau shows a box with a label "ISDN Port Circuit and Protocol Converter", and nothing more. The Abstract in Chau has no teaching whatsoever of translating protocols as claimed. Col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 2 lines 1-27 is a continuous portion of the specification of Chau, and refers to a method for communicating between endpoints in a telecommunications system. There nothing there reading on the specific functional limitations in the claim. The Examiner, to make this rejection, needs to recite the specific teaching of Chau that he believes reads on the specific limitations of the claimed invention. As a further example, there is no teching whatsoever in these applied portions of Chau to "*modulating the signals in a manner to correct signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points driven from a single point at the bridge adapter unit*" as claimed.

The applicant believes it is perfectly OK to allow a case if a decent rejection cannot be made, and there is no good art from which to make such a rejection, as in the present case. There seems to be some effort here to just drag this on and on, as though there is a prior decision that no allowance will be made. If the Examiner will take another look, recite specific teachings in Goodman and Chau, and support how those teachings read upon the limitations of claims 1 and 7, the applicant will be glad to consider the new action and respond; or else we can go back to appeal again.

Claim 1 is clearly patentable over the teachings of Goodman and Chau taken either singly or in combination. Claim 7, with essentially the same limitations, is therefore also clearly patentable, and claims 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, adn 14-17 are therefore patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination as argued and above have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dan Kikinis

by \_\_\_\_\_  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457